UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/664,858	09/19/2000	Ken Tamayama	450100-02719	5428

20999 7590 05/27/2004

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER	
EL HADY, NABIL M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	8

DATE MAILED: 05/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/664,858	Applicant(s) TAMAYAMA, KEN
	Examiner Nabil M El-Hady	Art Unit 2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 March 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1- 21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) __ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1- 21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. Claims 1-21 are pending in this application.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 8-13 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Horisawa et al. (WO99/34594), hereafter "Horisawa".

4. Horisawa is cited by the applicant in IDS paper No. 5, files 5/19/2003.

5. As to claim 8, Horisawa discloses the invention as claimed including an information processing method (Figs. 1, 7, and abstract), comprising: receiving a first type of information from a plurality types of information 9abstract, lines 1-4); storing a plurality of programs corresponding to a plurality of different methods capable of processing said plurality of different types of information (unit 3 is contained in a storage unit and adapted to perform a dedicated signal processing for each of communication media, see abstract); selecting a method from said plurality of different methods; (unit 3 selectively permits the reception of a desired communication medium, abstract); and processing said first type of information by reading a program corresponding to said method (common processing unit 5 of Figs. 1 and 7, for

performing common signal processing for a plurality of kinds of communication media, see abstract).

6. As to claim 15, the claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 8 above. In addition, a computer-readable recording medium containing a program for controlling an apparatus to execute the above method steps is inherent in Horisawa's disclosure.

7. As to claim 9, Horisawa discloses updating said plurality of programs (a front end unit 3 provided as required ....., abstract).

8. As to claims10 and 16, Horisawa discloses the types of information are transport streams (abstract).

9. As to claim11, Horisawa discloses converting the format of the first type of information into a different transport stream format (the data stream is subjected, in the common processing unit 5, to a predetermined signal processing to output an A/V signal, see abstract).

10. As to claims12 and 17, Horisawa discloses the plurality of different types of information includes multiplexed signals composed of images, sounds, and data (abstract, and Fig. 7).

11. As to claims13 and 18, Horisawa discloses performing a process for separating a multiplexed signal to output the first type of information (Fig. 7; and common processing unit 5 of Figs. 1 and 7, for performing common signal processing for a plurality of kinds of communication media, see abstract).

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 1-6 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horisawa et al. (WO99/34594), hereafter "Horisawa".

14. As to claim 1, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 8 above. In addition, Horisawa an information processing apparatus (Figs. 1, 7, and abstract), comprising: a receiver to receive a first type of information from a plurality of different types of information (3, Figs. 1 and 7); a first storage element to store a plurality of programs corresponding to a plurality of different methods capable of processing said plurality of different types of information (unit 3 is contained in a storage unit and adapted to perform a dedicated signal processing for each of communication media, see abstract); a program selector to select a method from said plurality of different methods (unit 3 selectively permits the reception of a desired communication medium, abstract); and a processor to process and control said first type of information by reading a program corresponding to said method (common processing unit 5 of Figs. 1 and 7, for performing common signal processing for a plurality of kinds of communication media, see abstract).

15. Horisawa does not explicitly designate a second storage element to store a designated method. However, It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the

invention that Horisawa's front end unit 3 which is contained in a storage unit and adapted to perform processing for each of the different types of the communication media (abstract) and selectively permits the reception of a desired communication medium (abstract) would perform its function by selectively designating a program stored in unit 3. Such selection of one of the plurality of the stored program methods obviously necessitates designating the storage area that store the selected one of the plurality of the stored program methods. This designation can be looked at as a secondary storage.

16. As to claim 2, Horisawa discloses updating said plurality of programs (a front end unit 3 provided as required ....., abstract).

17. As to claim 3, Horisawa discloses the types of information are transport streams (abstract).

18. As to claim 4, Horisawa discloses converting the format of the first type of information into a different transport stream format (the data stream is subjected, in the common processing unit 5, to a predetermined signal processing to output an A/V signal, see abstract).

19. As to claim 5, Horisawa discloses the plurality of different types of information includes multiplexed signals composed of images, sounds, and data (abstract, and Fig. 7).

20. As to claim 6, Horisawa discloses performing a process for separating a multiplexed signal to output the first type of information (Fig. 7; and common processing unit 5 of Figs. 1 and

7, for performing common signal processing for a plurality of kinds of communication media, see abstract).

21. As to claims 20 and 21, Horisawa does not disclose an instruction memory or a decoder. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that a storage area to store programs would include an instruction memory to store instructions in the programs, and the processing of these instructions necessitates an instruction decoder to interpret the instructions.

22. Claims 8-11 and 15-16 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Williams et al. (US 6,411,735), hereafter "Williams"

23. As to claim 8, Williams discloses the invention as claimed including an information processing method, comprising: receiving a first type of information from a plurality types of information (col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 5); storing a plurality of programs corresponding to a plurality of different methods capable of processing said plurality of different types of information (30, Fig. 1; and col. 5, lines 13-21); selecting a method from said plurality of different methods (col. 4, lines 45-55; 20, Fig. 1; and col. 5, lines 5-11); and processing said first type of information by reading a program corresponding to said method (41, Fig. 1; and col. 5, lines 21-27).

24. As to claim 15, the claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 8 above. In addition, a computer-readable recording medium containing a program for controlling an apparatus to execute the above method steps, is inherent in Williams's disclosure.

25. As to claim 9, Williams discloses changing said plurality of programs in accordance with the information received (col. 5, lines 19-27).

26. As to claims 10 and 16, Williams discloses the types of information are transport streams (col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 5).

27. As to claim11, Williams discloses performing a process for converting the format of a transport stream as the type of information received by said receiving means into a different transport stream format (col. 5, lines 19-27).

28. Claims 1-4 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. (US 6,411,735), hereafter "Williams"

29. As to claim 1, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 8 above. In addition, Williams discloses an information processing apparatus (Fig. 1), comprising: a receiver to receive a first type of information from a plurality of different types of information (DATA INPUT and DATA BUFFER 10, Fig. 1; and col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 5); a first storage element to store a plurality of programs corresponding to a plurality of different methods capable of processing said plurality of different types of information (30, Fig. 1; and col. 5, lines 13-21); a program selector to select a method from said plurality of different methods (20, Fig. 1; col. 4, lines 45-55; and col. 5, lines 5-11); and a processor to process and control said first type of information by reading a program corresponding to said method (41, Fig. 1; and col. 5, lines 21-27).

30. Williams does not explicitly designate a second storage element to store a designated method. However, Williams's control section 41 of Fig. 1 uses the information derived from the image selection section 20 to control the image processing section 30, that store the plurality of different methods. In other words, the control section 41, selects the proper method according to the selected type of image (col. 5, lines 19-27). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that such selection of one of the plurality of the stored program methods obviously necessitates designating the storage area that includes said one of the plurality of the stored program methods. This area represents the second storage area.

31. As to claim 2, Williams discloses changing said plurality of programs in accordance with the information received (col. 5, lines 19-27).

32. As to claim 3, Williams discloses the types of information are transport streams (col. 4, line 66 to col. 5, line 5).

33. As to claim 4, Williams discloses performing a process for converting the format of a transport stream as the type of information received by said receiving means into a different transport stream format (col. 5, lines 19-27).

34. As to claims 20 and 21, Williams does not disclose an instruction memory or a decoder. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that a storage area to store programs would include an instruction memory to store instructions in the

programs, and the processing of these instructions necessitates an instruction decoder to interpret the instructions.

35. Claims 8, 9, and 15 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Creswell et al. (US 6,445,783), hereafter "Creswell".

36. As to claim 8, Creswell discloses the invention as claimed including an information processing method (120, 125, Fig. 1; Fig. 2; and abstract), comprising: receiving a first type of information from a plurality types of information (col. 1, lines 41-42; col. 2, lines 28-33; col. 3, lines 6-8; and col. 4, lines 42-43); storing a plurality of programs corresponding to a plurality of different methods capable of processing said plurality of different types of information (125 of Fig. 1; and col. 1, lines 41-43); selecting a method from said plurality of different methods (col. 1, lines 49-51; col. 3, lines 44-46); and processing said first type of information by reading a program corresponding to said method (col. 1, lines 51-56; col. 3, lines 1-3; col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 1-5).

37. As to claim 15, the claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 8 above. In addition, a computer-readable recording medium containing a program for controlling an apparatus to execute the above method steps, is inherent in Creswell's disclosure.

38. As to claim 9, Creswell discloses updating said plurality of programs (col. 4, lines 44-47).

39. Claims 1-2 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Creswell et al. (US 6,445,783), hereafter "Creswell".

40. As to claim 1, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 8 above. In addition, Creswell discloses an information processing apparatus (Fig. 1), comprising: a receiver to receive a first type of information from a plurality of different types of information (col. 1, lines 41-42; col. 2, lines 28-33; col. 3, lines 6-8; and col. 4, lines 42-43); a first storage element to store a plurality of programs corresponding to a plurality of different methods capable of processing said plurality of different types of information (125 of Fig. 1; and col. 1, lines 41-43); a program selector to select a method from said plurality of different methods (col. 1, lines 49-51; col. 3, lines 44-46); and a processor to process and control said first type of information by reading a program corresponding to said method (col. 1, lines 51-56; col. 3, lines 1-3; col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 1-5).

41. Creswell does not explicitly designate a second storage element to store a designated method. However, Creswell's controller 200 of Fig. 2 of Fig. 1of the specialized processor 120 uses the information derived from the database 125 (or from memory 240) to identify the appropriate special processing (col. 3, line 66 to col. 5, line 3). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that such identification of one of the plurality of the special processing methods (stored program methods) obviously necessitates designating the storage area that store the selected one of the plurality of the stored program methods. This designated area represents the second storage.

42. As to claim 2, Creswell discloses updating said plurality of programs (col. 4, lines 44-47).

43. As to claims 20 and 21, Creswell does not disclose an instruction memory or a decoder. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that a storage area to store programs would include an instruction memory to store instructions in the programs, and the processing of these instructions necessitates an instruction decoder to interpret the instructions.

44. Claims 7, 14, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horisawa et al. (WO99/34594), hereafter "Horisawa", or Williams et al. (US 6,411,735), hereafter "Williams" or Creswell et al. (US 6,445,783), hereafter "Creswell" in view of Sokawa et al. (EP0794663), hereafter "Sokawa".

45. Sokawa is cited by the applicant in IDS paper No. 5, files 5/19/2003.

46. As to claims 7, 14, and 19, Sokawa discloses processing signals of different broadcast systems (that may include a satellite broadcast signal, a terrestrial broadcast signal, a community antenna television signal, and a signal input from an external unit) using a single signal processing circuit by only changing a program (col. 3, lines 29-36). Sokawa discloses a memory containing a microprogram that specifies a decoding process algorithm, programmable operation means receiving a vides signal and executing the video decoding process according to the microprogram, and a microprogram unit controlling transmission of the microprogram contained in the memory to the programmable operation means (co. 3, lines 45-53).

47. Applicant's arguments filed 3/11/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore the rejection of claims 1-19 is maintained.

48. In the remarks, applicants argued in substance that (1),Horisawa fails to teach or suggest having a storage element that can store multiple programs corresponding to a plurality of different methods, and a program selector to select one method. (2), Williams fails to teach or suggest having a storage element that can store multiple programs corresponding to a plurality of different methods, and a program selector to select one method. (3),Creswell fails to teach or suggest having a storage element that can store multiple programs corresponding to a plurality of different methods, and a program selector to select one method.

49. Examiner respectfully traverses applicants' remarks.

50. As to point (1), (2), and (3), applicant is referred to sections 5, 13, 23, 29, 36, and 40 above to explain how Horisawa, Williams, and Creswell, each teach a storage element that can store multiple programs corresponding to a plurality of different methods, and a program selector to select one method.

51. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

52. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nabil M El-Hady whose telephone number is (703) 308-7990. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

May 26, 2004

Nabil El-Hady, Ph.D, M.B.A.
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2154